

REMARKS

This communication responds to the Office Action mailed January 22, 2009, for the application captioned above. By this amendment, claim 1 is amended. No new matter has been added as result of this amendment. The following remarks are respectfully submitted.

Substance of the Interview

Applicant is grateful to the Examiner for granting a telephone interview with Applicant's representative, Elisabeth Lacy Belden, on June 10, 2009. In the telephone interview, Ms. Belden proposed an amendment to claim 1 in order to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), which the Examiner set forth in the office action mailed January 22, 2009. In the office action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 89 and 98 as being unpatentable over USP 5,681,100 to Powell in view of USP 1,751,569 to Winship. Ms. Belden proposed that claim 1 be amended to include the phrase "without being secured thereto" after "the stand", in line 12 thereof. The Examiner indicated that this amendment appears to overcome the rejection based on Powell in view of Winship, but that this does not necessarily mean that the amended claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

35 USC §103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 89 and 98 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USP 5,681,100 to Powell in view of USP 1,751,569 to Winship. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims, based upon the amendment to claim 1, as presented herein, and upon the following arguments.

Neither Powell nor Winship, either individually or in combination, teach or suggest every limitation of claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 89 and 98. For example, independent claim 1 defines a jewelry storage system wherein a peg is placed in an opening in a jewelry cabinet sidewall such that the peg extends from the sidewall and rests against an exterior surface of a stand, which receives the cabinet; claim 1, as amended, further defines the peg to rest against the exterior surface of the stand, without being secured thereto, to position the cabinet so that a back wall of

the cabinet is inclined with respect to a horizontal plane. The Examiner has asserted that Powell discloses all the elements recited in claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 89 and 98, with the exception of an opening in a cabinet sidewall and a peg placed in the opening such that the peg extends from the sidewall to rest against an exterior surface of a stand that receives the cabinet. Thus, the Examiner cites Winship and asserts that Winship discloses an alternative structure, in which the bolts 30/31 thereof are like the peg of claim 1 of the present application. From this assertion, the Examiner concludes that it would be obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the structure of Powell in view of the teaching of Winship, by providing a cabinet sidewall including an opening and a peg placed in the opening such that the peg extends from the sidewall to rest against an exterior surface of a stand to position the cabinet so that a back wall of the cabinet is inclined with respect to a horizontal plane. Yet, Applicant respectfully asserts that the peg of claim 1 cannot be likened to the bolts 30,31 of Winship, since, rather than resting against an exterior surface of a stand, without being secured thereto, the bolts 30, 31 are inserted through slides 25, 26 in order to mount the cabinet of Winship in the slides 25, 26. Those skilled in the art will appreciate that each of the bolts 30, 31 is secured to a corresponding slide 25, 26 in order to secure the cabinet to the slides 25, 26.

In light of the amendment to claim 1 and the argument presented above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 2, 6, 10, 12, 13, 89 and 98.

Claims 7, 8, 14, 106, 107, 109 and 112 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell, as modified, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USP 4,776,650 to Ferenzi and USP 5,511,873 to Mech. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 7, 8, 14, 106, 107, 109 and 112, based upon the amendment to claim 1, on which these claims depend, and upon the argument presented above, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Claims 9, 87 and 110 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell, as modified, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USP 4,282,975 to Ovadia. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 9, 87 and 110, based upon the amendment to claim 1, on which these claims depend, and upon the argument presented above, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Claims 11, 81 and 113 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Powell, as modified, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of USP 4,36,240 to Henson. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 11, 81 and 113, based upon the amendment to claim 1, on which these claims depend, and upon the argument presented above, and respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of these claims.

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of the application are respectfully requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes it would be useful to advance prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

/Natalie D. Kadievitch/

Dated: June 19, 2009

Natalie D. Kadievitch
Reg. No. 34,196

Customer No. 22859
FREDRIKSON & BYRON, P.A.
200 South Sixth Street, Suite 4000
Minneapolis, MN 55402-1425 USA
Telephone: (612) 492-7000
Facsimile: (612) 492-7077

Please grant any extension of time necessary for entry; charge any fee due to Deposit Account No. 06-1910.